

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 16-25 are pending in this application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Entry of this Response is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116(b) because the Response: (a) places the application in condition for allowance as discussed below; (b) does not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and (c) places the application in better form for appeal. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of this Amendment.

In the Office Action, claims 21-25 are allowed. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowance.

In the Office Action, claims 3, 5, 7-10 and 18-20 are objected to but would be allowable if rewritten to incorporate all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Based on the remarks below, Applicants respectfully contend that because independent claims 1 and 16 are allowable as currently written no further revisions are necessary.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 16, and 17 are rejected under 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Lowrey *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,328,810), hereinafter "Lowrey". With respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that Lowrey fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention as is required under 102(e). For example, Lowrey does not disclose or suggest *recrystallizing* the polycrystalline semiconductor layer. (emphasis added)(See claim 1, as similarly recited in claim 16.)

Interpreting Lowrey only for the purposes of this response, Applicants submit that Lowrey merely discloses a method for reducing the masking pitch of a photolithographic process. Title. There is simply no teaching, or suggestion, in Lowrey of any recrystallizing

whatsoever. In fact, the words "recrystal" and "recrystallize" do not even appear anywhere in Lowrey.

In response to Applicants' previously submitted remarks arguing that Lowrey does not teach or suggest recrystallizing the polycrystalline semiconductor layer (see Office Action response, dated November 30, 2005), the Office states "Lowrey et al discloses recrystallizing the polycrystalline semiconductor layer, as disclosed in Column 7, lines 7-14." Office Action, Page 2. However, the section of the specification (Col. 7, lines 7-14) cited by the Office is entirely devoid of any disclosure, teaching, or suggestion of any type of recrystallizing of a polycrystalline semiconductor layer. In fact, this section of the specification merely discusses using either a chemical-mechanical planarization step on spin-on glass (SOG) or a planarizing etch-back step using oxygen plasma chemistry on a photoresist. Neither of these techniques in Lowrey teach, or remotely suggest, a recrystallizing step, as in claim 1.

In the Office Action, the Examiner further alleges that Lowrey discloses "recrystallizing the polycrystalline semiconductor layer to have a crystallinity substantially similar to that of the base structure" and cites "Column 7, lines 29-47" for the location of this disclosure in Lowrey. Office Action, Page 2. However, the section of the specification (Col. 7, lines 29-47) cited by the Examiner is also entirely devoid of any disclosure, teaching, or suggestion of any type of a recrystallizing of a polycrystalline semiconductor layer. This cited section merely discusses applying an isotropic oxygen plasma etch to photoresist strips 121 to reduce their size. In fact, not only does this section not discuss recrystallizing, it does not even discuss a polycrystalline semiconductor layer or a monocrystalline base structure. Finally, the section even teaches away from even the remotest suggestion of recrystallizing *other materials* (i.e., photoresist). "Due to a relatively low decomposition temperature of photoresist, only low temperature deposition

processes may be utilized to deposit conformal layers thereon." Col. 7, lines 35-38. This is a clear teaching away of allowing any type of structural change to the photoresist, and certainly is not remotely suggesting recrystallizing, or any sort.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that there is no disclosure or suggestion in Lowrey of a method that includes a step of recrystallizing a polycrystalline semiconductor layer with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In the Office Action, independent claim 16 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1. As a result, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments submitted above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.


With respect to dependent claims 2-10, and 17-20, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 14, 2006


Spencer K. Warnick
Reg. No.: 40,398

(JJC)

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)